

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



FILED

02/19/20
09:36 AM

February 19, 2020

Agenda ID # 18182

Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 12-04-019:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Haga. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's March 26, 2020 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties of record may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

The Commission may hold a Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting to consider this item in closed session in advance of the Business Meeting at which the item will be heard. In such event, notice of the Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting will appear in the Daily Calendar, which is posted on the Commission's website. If a Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting is scheduled, *ex parte* communications are prohibited pursuant to Rule 8.2(c)(4)(B).

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon

Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:ilz

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates.

Application 12-04-019

DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION TO WATER PLUS DUE TO A LACK OF SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 18-09-017

Intervenor: Water Plus	For contribution to Decision (D.) 18-09-017
Claimed: \$284,745.00	Awarded: \$0.00
Assigned Commissioner: Liane M. Randolph	Assigned ALJ: Robert W. Haga

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES:

A. Brief description of Decision:	In this decision, the Commission approved a modified Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project, adopted settlement agreements, issued a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, and certified a combined environmental report.
-----------------------------------	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:¹

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	June 6, 2012	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	June 18, 2012	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.12-04-019	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	September 27, 2012	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:		A.12-04-019
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		September 27, 2012
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D. 18-09-107	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	September 20, 2018	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	November 12, 3018	November 13, 2018
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
9-12	<p>As indicated in the NOI, Water Plus is a Monterey Peninsula water- ratepayer advocacy group. It was formed in September 2010 and has met weekly since then and acted in behalf of local Cal-Am residential ratepayers.</p> <p>No member of Water Plus has any direct economic interest in outcomes of the proceeding.</p>	Noted

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION:

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. Monterey County Ordinance. This was a threshold issue and, having little experience with the CPUC in 2012, Water Plus hired an attorney to do the Opening Brief on the issue. The Decision addressed the issue most notably in Conclusion of Law 62. Because of my limited experience on the issue, I am requesting the lowest Hourly Rate Table expert rate for my few references to it in these filings.</p> <p>The attorney's rate is for the Opening Brief on Preemption.</p>	<p>5/24/2012 Protest against A.12-04-019, p. 3</p> <p>5/30/2012 Statement by Water Plus, p. 3</p> <p>7/11/2012 Opening Brief on Preemption, pp. 1-31</p> <p>10/10/2012 Comments on Preemption Decision, pp. 1-8</p> <p>1/9/2013 Water Plus Comments, pp. 1-3</p> <p>9/4/2018 Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 11-12</p>	<p>Water Plus argued that Cal-Am had not proven pre-emption and that the Monterey Desalination Ordinance was enforceable. D.12-10-030 rejected that position and found the Commission's authority preempts the Monterey County Desalination Ordinance. Water Plus failed to make a significant contribution to the Monterey County Ordinance issue.</p>
<p>2. Demand estimation. This is one of the most important issues involved in the MPWSP. The Decision made extensive references to it, mainly on pages 19-70 and Findings of Fact 12-14, 15-17, 21-25, and 29-45, as well as Conclusions of Law 6, 10-17, and 80. As an expert with 37 years of experience in econometrics, I am requesting an expert rate</p>	<p>1/21/2014 Opening Brief of Water Plus, pp. 3-6</p> <p>2/14/2014 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 4-5</p> <p>7/9/2015 Opening Brief, pp. 2-3</p> <p>10/20/2015 Water Plus Amendments to Proposal, p. 2</p> <p>1/22/2016 Testimony, pp. 10-12 plus Appe X</p> <p>3/30/2016 Motion for Project Dismiss, pp. 3-91</p>	<p>Concerning issue 2 – Demand estimation, the Commission specifically rejected Water Plus's assertions. The Commission stated that Water Plus's analysis failed to take into account other costs, influences, and externalities; and that Water Plus's assumed costs of alternatives was flawed. Commission concluded that Water Plus's approach was not</p>

<p>at the high end of the scale on the Hourly Rate Table.. Challenging the Decision's conclusions, which concur with Cal Am's, my analysis shows that the approved project would provide a large and costly oversupply of water in the near term. The CPUC should have required a panel of economists to review the demand estimates made by Cal Am engineers, as Water Plus suggested in these filings. I believe the CPUC was too much concerned with an undersupply to take steps to avoid a large oversupply, which could be highly costly to Cal Am or ratepayers, or both. In particular, the Decision failed to acknowledge the economic relationship, observed over and over in these Water Plus filings and demonstrated with actual Monterey Peninsula data (see filings' appendices), that demand goes down as rates go up. This issue is subject to litigation, which acceptance of the advice in these Water Plus filings could have avoided.</p>	<p>10/4/2017 Proposed Testimony (Struck Version), pp. 9-11 11/13/2017 Reinstated Stricken Testimony, p. 1</p> <p>12/15/2017 Opening Brief of Water Plus, pp. 2-8</p> <p>1/9/2018 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 4-8</p> <p>2/19/2018 Water Plus Motion to Strike, pp. 1-4 plus Appendix</p> <p>4/19/2018 Opening Brief of Water Plus (amended), pp. 2-5</p> <p>5/3/2018 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 4-5</p> <p>5/11/2018 Conditional Joinder of Water Plus, pp. 1-2</p> <p>5/31/2018 Water Plus Motion to Strike, pp. 1, 2, 8</p> <p>6/15/2018 Water Plus Response to MCWD Request, pp. 1-2</p> <p>9/4/2018 Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 3-11, 25</p> <p>9/10/2018 Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 1-4</p>	<p>reasonable. (D.18-09-017 at p. 64-65).</p>
<p>3. Agency Act and Return Water. This has been a critical issue</p>	<p>7/14/2015 Opening Brief, pp. 14-17</p>	<p>Water Plus claims to have made significant contribution to the</p>

<p>because of the Agency Act's prohibition of the exportation of groundwater from the Salinas Valley. The Decision addresses this issue on pages 103-112 and Findings of Fact 66-70, 146-148, and 188-196, as well as Conclusions of Law 29, 61, 68- 69, 83, and 86. In my CPUC filings, I have devoted considerable attention to this issue. As I have indicated in these filings for Water Plus, the Decision has made a substantial error in concluding that the percentage of return water is equal to the percentage of freshwater in the source water (e.g., 7%) when it is equal to a multiple of that value, in fact approximately three times that value (21%) as a percentage of desalinated water delivered to the Monterey Peninsula, the reason being that source water is about three times the amount of delivered water. Because of my extensive background in statistics, I am requesting a compensation rate at the high end of the Hourly Rate Table expert scale. This issue is subject to litigation, which acceptance of the advice</p>	<p>11/22/2016 Testimony, pp. 2-5</p> <p>6/28/2016 Comments on Return Water Agreement, pp. 6-7</p> <p>8/5/2016 Reply to Comments on Return Water, pp. 1-9</p> <p>8/22/2016 Response to Motion to Strike, pp. 1-3</p> <p>6/1/2017 Motion to Dismiss, pp. 13-18</p> <p>10/31/2017 Proposed Testimony (Struck Version), pp. 25-28</p> <p>12/8/2017 Comments on HWG Final Report, pp. 1-18</p> <p>12/15/2017 Opening Brief of Water Plus, pp. 11-12</p> <p>1/9/2018 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 8-13</p> <p>2/14/2018 Ex Parte Communication, p. 1</p> <p>4/19/2018 Opening Brief (amended), pp. 8-17</p> <p>5/3/2018 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 6-8</p> <p>5/31/2018 Water Plus Motion to Strike, pp. 4-5</p> <p>9/4/2018 Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 12</p>	<p>Return Water issue (Issue 3). To the contrary, Water Plus not only failed to make a significant contribution, but now asserts that D.18-09-017 made a substantial error regarding the return water percentage (Claim at p. 6-7). The Commission did not rely on Water Plus's position in any significant way.</p>
---	---	--

in these Water Plus CPUC filings could have avoided.		
<p>4. Lack of Water Rights. Though critical, the issue has received relatively little attention in the Decision, mainly on pages 80-82 and Findings of Fact 57-71, as well as Conclusions of Law 31 and 90. Not being an attorney, I am requesting a rate in the midrange of the scale. The main conclusion on the issue in the Water Plus filings is that Cal Am cannot acquire rights under the beneficial-use- without-harm doctrine because about 60% of the water drawn would be thrown out to sea, where its use would be less than beneficial. This is an issue subject to litigation, which might have been avoided had the CPUC adopted the Water Plus recommendation in the third of the filings here to delay the decision to allow for alternative water supplies to become available.</p>	<p>5/24/2012 Protest against A.12-04-019, p. 4</p> <p>5/30/2012 Statement by Water Plus, p. 3</p> <p>9/4/18 Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 12-13</p>	<p>Water Plus failed to make a significant contribution to the Water Rights issue. Water Plus did not substantially contribute to the issue of water rights because the Commission did not adopt any portion of any argument made by Water Plus.</p>
<p>5. Modeling and Data Corruption. The issue of modeling and data corruption falls right within my bailiwick of expertise. In addition to a Ph.D., I have had over</p>	<p>6/1/2015 Response to Common Briefing Outline, p. 3</p> <p>7/14/2015 Opening Brief, p. 5</p> <p>8/21/2015 Comment on Data Request for DEIR, pp. 1-11</p>	<p>Water Plus failed to make substantial contribution on the issue of Modeling and Data Corruption. Data corruption was not established and was not a factor in any</p>

<p>half a century of experience and hold two patents in the field. This background justifies my request for compensation at the high end of the Hourly Rate Table scale. Mostly on pages 11, 17-19, and 71, as well as Findings of Fact 100-103, 116, 122-124, 191, and 195 and Conclusions of Law 25-27, 35-39, and 44, the Decision hardly addresses this issue, despite its importance. In these filings and comments on the EIR, Water Plus is largely responsible for the three-year delay and revisions of what remains to be a terribly-flawed EIR. The major finding in the extensive Water Plus attention to this issue in these filings and EIR comments is that the data used to evaluate the first two models employed by consultants had been seriously corrupted, while the last model used has undergone no evaluation of its validity in application to test-well and monitoring-well data. The final EIR conclusions have no solid basis. As I recommended in the later filings cited here, the CPUC should have required a panel of</p>	<p>9/4/2015 Data Request 4 to CPUC, p. 1</p> <p>9/28/2015 Comments on Data Tampering, pp. 1-12</p> <p>10/13/2015 Motion on Data Tampering to Dismiss, pp. 1-13</p> <p>10/30/2015 Demand for Discovery Evidence, pp. 1-19</p> <p>12/7/2015 Discovery Request (Increased Specificity), 1-17</p> <p>3/30/2016 Project Dismissal, pp. 16-18</p> <p>4/21/2016 Reply to Response to Motion to Dismiss, pp. 7-10</p> <p>2/17/2017 Support of Motion to Recirculate EIR/EIS, pp. 1-6</p> <p>6/1/2017 Motion to Dismiss, pp. 1-12</p> <p>5/3/2018 Reply Brief of Water Plus, pp. 5-6</p> <p>5/31/2018 Motion to Strike, pp. 2-3</p> <p>9/4/2018 Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 13-22</p>	<p>Commission decision. As part of D.18-09-017, the Commission specifically found that Water Plus provided no direct evidence in support of the data tampering accusations and the evidence indicated “that the data tampering accusations are false.” (D.18-09-017, Appendix J, Responses to Comments Received After Publication of MPWSP Final EIR/EIS, p. 2, as cited by Cal-Am in its Response at 8.)</p>
---	---	---

<p>professional statisticians to review the data analysis.</p> <p>Hydrogeologists do not have sufficient expertise in statistics to do that.</p> <p>This issue is subject to litigation, which acceptance of the advice in these Water Plus filings to dismiss this proceeding could have avoided.</p>		
<p>6. Project alternatives. Minimizing the unique problems of the preferred alternative, the Decision addressed this issue mostly on pages 78-79 and Findings of Fact 18-20, 26-28, 75-78, and 93-97, as well as Conclusion of Law 9. The concerns of Water Plus on this issue focused on (a) the highly risky inexperience with slant-well use relative to the vast experience with open-ocean intake and on (b) the contamination of irrigation water with pesticides in the source water Pure Water Monterey recycles for irrigation use without Advanced treatment, according to a side deal with Monterey County. Because I have devoted considerable time to this issue in preparation for these Water Plus filings, I am requesting a rate in the midrange of the</p>	<p>5/29/2012 Protest against A1204019, pp. 7-8</p> <p>5/30/2012 Statement by Water Plus, pp. 1-5</p> <p>3/21/2013 Revised Testimony, pp. 3-9</p> <p>8/1/2013 Comments on Settlement Agreement, pp. 1-8</p> <p>8/22/2013 Response to Motion to Bifurcate, pp. 1-7</p> <p>1/21/2014 Opening Brief, pp. 1-11</p> <p>2/14/2014 Response to Common Briefing Outline, pp. 1-13</p> <p>6/1/2015 Response to Common Briefing Outline, p. 4</p> <p>7/14/2015 Opening Brief, pp. 19-22</p> <p>1/22/2016 Testimony, pp. 1-14</p> <p>3/30/2016 Project Dismissal, pp. 1-19</p>	<p>None of Water Plus's recommendations regarding alternatives or claims regarding contaminated source water was adopted by the Commission in any ruling or decision in this proceeding.</p>

Hourly Rate Table scale.	<p>4/21/2016 Reply to Response to Motion to Dismiss, pp. 3-5</p> <p>5/19/2016 Rebuttal Testimony, pp. 13</p> <p>7/10/2017 Statement by Water Plus, pp. 1-8</p> <p>10/4/2017 Proposed Testimony (Struck Version), pp. 2-4</p> <p>5/3/2018 Reply Brief, pp. 8-10</p> <p>5/11/2018 Conditional Joinder, pp. 1-3</p> <p>8/19/2018 Opening Brief (amended), pp. 7-8</p> <p>9/4/2018 Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 22-23</p>	
--------------------------	---	--

B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding? ²	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Marina Coast Water District, City of Marina, Public Water Now, Citizens for Just Water, Public Trust Alliance, Planning & Conservation League.		Verified
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: Although all the above parties in common with Water Plus opposed Cal Am's desal project, Water Plus was virtually unique in its arguments on		Noted

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) was renamed the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) pursuant to Senate Bill 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

demand estimation, return water, water rights, model evaluation, recycling, and subsurface intake.	
--	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION:**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: I have a separate reason for each issue because I am a highly qualified expert on some but not others. See my comment on each issue above. Generally, I have a Ph.D. from Princeton University and over a half-century of experience in statistical modeling and 37 years of experience in econometrics, both fields highly relevant to issues in the proceeding. I have two patents in statistical modeling and am listed in Marquis' Who's Who in California, Who's Who in America, and Who's Who in the World. I am identified as Expert 1 and Preparer 1 in the table below. I am not claiming cost for travel.</p>	Water Plus has not made substantial contribution to the outcome of Decision 18-09-017
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: The hours I spent depended on how much research I had to do to prepare for each CPUC filing. I got into each issue as deeply as I could. This proceeding has gone on for longer than six years, and Water Plus, which I founded and have served as president, was one of the first parties to join the proceeding.</p>	Water Plus has not made substantial contribution to the outcome of Decision 18-09-017
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: Issue 1, 90 hours; Issue 2, 152 hours; Issue 3, 176 hours; Issue 4, 6 hours; Issue 5, 226 hours; Issue 6, 129 hours.</p>	Not Reviewed

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paul Hart Attorney	2013	62.5	\$320	See below	\$20,000.00			
Weitzman Expert	2012	4	\$165	See Issue 4	\$660.00			
Weitzman Expert	2013	26	\$135	See Issue 1	\$3,510.00			
Weitzman Expert	2013	10	\$165	See Issue 6	\$1,650.00			
Weitzman Expert	2014	14	\$420	See Issue 2	\$5,880.00			
Weitzman Expert	2014	17	\$170	See Issue 6	\$2,890.00			
Weitzman Expert	2015	8	\$420	See Issue 2	\$3,360.00			
Weitzman Expert	2015	6	\$420	See Issue 3	\$2,520.00			
Weitzman Expert	2015	146	\$420	See Issue 5	\$61,320.00			
Weitzman Expert	2015	9	\$170	See Issue 6	\$1530.00			
Weitzman Expert	2016	20	\$425	See Issue 2	\$8,500.00			
Weitzman Expert	2016	52	\$425	See Issue 3	\$22,100.00			
Weitzman Expert	2016	18	\$425	See Issue 5	\$7,650.00			
Weitzman Expert	2016	28	\$170	See Issue 6	\$4,760.00			
Weitzman Expert	2017	40	\$435	See Issue 2	\$17,400.00			
Weitzman Expert	2017	70	\$435	See Issue 3	\$30,450.00			
Weitzman Expert	2017	36	\$435	See Issue 5	\$15,660.00			

Weitzman Expert	2017	19	\$175	See Issue 6	\$3,325.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	2	\$150	See Issue 1	\$300.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	70	\$445	See Issue 2	\$31,150.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	48	\$445	See Issue 3	\$21,360.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	2	\$180	See Issue 4	\$360.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	26	\$445	See Issue 5	\$11,570.00			
Weitzman Expert	2018	10	\$180	See Issue 6	\$1,800.00			
Subtotal: \$279,705.00						Subtotal: \$0.00 [A]		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Weitzman Expert	2018	56	\$90	½ 2018 rate for Experts	5,040.00			
Subtotal: \$5,040.00						Subtotal: \$0.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$284,745.00						TOTAL AWARD: \$0.00 [A]		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors’ records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney			Date Admitted to CA BAR ³		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation	
Paul Lester Hart			September, 2005		237766		No	

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1.	Certificate of Service
2.	Time Records
3.	Qualifications of Expert 1

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[A]	The Intervenor Compensation Claim is denied for Water Plus due to lack of substantial contribution to Decision 18-09-017.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS:

(Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c)))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	Yes
--	-----

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion
California-American Water Company	Water Plus has not met the requirements to receive intervenor compensation and should be denied.	Lack of substantial contribution from Water Plus.
Water Plus	Response to California-American Water Company's opposition.	Response noted.

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No
--	----

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

Water Plus has failed to make a substantial contribution to D.18-09-017.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Water Plus failed to satisfy all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. The intervenor compensation claim filed by Water Plus is rejected.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1809017		
Proceeding(s):	A1204019		
Author:	ALJ Haga		
Payer(s):	California-American Water Company ratepayers		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change / Disallowance
Water Plus	11/13/2018	\$284,745.00	\$0.00	N/A	Lack of substantial contribution

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Paul	Hart	Attorney	\$320.00	2013	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$165.00	2012	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$135.00-\$165.00	2013	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$170.00-\$420.00	2014	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$170.00-\$420.00	2015	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$170.00-\$425.00	2016	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$175.00-\$435.00	2017	Not Addressed
Ron	Weitzman	Expert	\$150.00-\$445.00	2018	Not Addressed

(END OF APPENDIX)